BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: BILL HUEY, GLEN GARDNER, JULIA MARTIN, FILLMORE

WILSON, LINDSAY VAN SLAMBROOK

STAFF PRESENT: KIM HLAVIN, TORY PARISH



RESULTS

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW-SMALL

July 22, 2021

4:30 P.M.

"virtually via Zoom Webinar"

1. 4 Hagood Avenue - - TMS # 460-11-01-025

BAR2021-000550

Request final approval for complete demolition.

Category 4

(Westside)

Old City District

Owner:

Burns M. Forsythe, II

Applicant:

Burns M. Forsythe, II

MOTION:

Approval

MADE BY: MARTIN SECOND: WILSON VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

- 1. In reviewing an application to demolish any existing structure, the Board of Architectural Review shall consider, among other things, the historic, architectural and aesthetic features of such structure, the nature and character of the surrounding area, the historic or culturally important use of such structure and the importance to the city. (Section 54-240 B.) We do understand the challenges the owner faces, and the considerations that the Board must take into account, these considerations are weighed equally against the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
- 2. While the original portion of the house is tucked between two later additions, neither of these construction campaigns retain any considerable amount of viable fabric to be preserved in situ. What would essentially be preserved is the form. The building would be required to be elevated considerably, increasing risk of loss.
- 3. Commercially zoned parcels surround the historic house in three directions and a freeway, two fast-food chains, and a highway are adjacent the parcel. Currently, the parcel is DR-2F which is residential, and could have a church, or elderly housing.
- 4. While the house has been in the family since its construction, the great-grandfather of current owners was Burns M Forsythe, and along with his wife, Miss Ruby Forsythe, they are the most notable figures to own the cottage. He was a prominent figure as founder of a school for African American children in Pawley's Island, where Miss Ruby was also a well-respected and esteemed educator. That legacy, staff feel, is protected and will live on in the school that still remains, and not within the house that they lived in for a very short time.

Staff Recommendation: Approval

2. 84 Bull Street, Unit E - - TMS # 457-03-02-160

BAR2021-000565

Request final approval for after-the-fact replacement of entry door, patio doors, and new construction of wall.

Not Rated

(Harleston Village)

c. pre 1850s

Old and Historic District

Owner:

Will Shalosky

Will Shalosky Applicant:

MOTION: Denial of after-the-fact application, and to apply to BAR staff for three new wood doors with glass transoms to replace the three existing doors, with Board comment that glass panels could be considered as a replacement for panels on the south facing doors; and redesign of a picket fence at the knee wall; and to obtain permit for this and any other work; with final review by staff.

MADE BY: HUEY SECOND: WILSON VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

The work that was done without a permit or BAR application includes the replacement of a door that fronts Rutledge of unknown age, that was a 6-panel wood, with three-light transom. <u>July 22, 2021 Page | 2</u>

It is now a $\frac{3}{4}$ glass door, with bead-board transom. French doors also replaced two other 6-panel doors facing Bull Street. Finally, a horizontal slatted, wood-privacy fence was installed at the foundation of the front of the house, atop the existing stucco knee wall and behind a partial iron picket fence, effectively enclosing the patio.

- Historically, solid wood doors would have been located in these openings in foundations.
 A modern glass door seems inappropriate for this utilitarian access to the area under the living space of the house. The French doors are certainly out of character with the stucco foundation for this location. The bead-board panel is inappropriate in lieu of the three-light transom. Replace doors with appropriate six-panel door, and three-light transom.
- 2. A wood privacy fence is inappropriate for several reasons as a solid fence should not front the street of an urban, residential block. It lessens the pedestrian experience and relationship to the street. The horizontal fencing is not appropriate for this urban design; staff very infrequently approve the design for rear yards. Eliminate solid fence in favor of an iron picket fence similar to what is on the other side of the stair, in the mirrored courtyard.

Staff Recommendation: Denial with requirement to apply to the BAR staff for three, 6-paneled doors with glass transoms to replace the three doors, and redesign of an iron fence on the knee wall, and to obtain a building permit for this and any other work.

3. 95 Logan Street - - TMS # 457-08-03-008

BAR2021-000566

Old and Historic District

Request final approval of paint color change.

Category 4 (Harleston Village)

c. 1880

Owner: Steven Nicoll and Catherine Rogers

Applicant: Steven Nicoll and Catherine Rogers

WITHDRAWN FOR STAFF REVIEW

4. 7 Smith Street - - TMS # 457-08-03-077

BAR2021-000567

Request conceptual approval for a new two-story addition to rear, including elevator; addition to existing accessory building to allow one-car garage; and hardscaping including pool at rear.

Not Rated

(Harleston Village)

c. 1940

Old and Historic District

Owner:

John and Elizabeth Rhoads

Applicant:

Guv Gottshalk

MOTION:

Approval of additions to accessory building and hardscaping at rear, and deferral of addition to main house for restudy providing a recessed hyphen to delineate the addition and any addition to be recessed in plane from the sidewall of existing house.

MADE BY: <u>HUEY</u> SECOND: <u>WILSON</u> VOTE: FOR <u>4</u> AGAINST <u>0</u> MARTIN ABSTAINED

Staff Comments:

- 1. Any addition to an historic house in Charleston should be clearly delineated as an addition, with a light and reversible touch, keeping details intact where possible. This addition proposes to eliminate the defined corner and eave return with a false chimney elevator, which is inappropriate. We recommend recessing the addition and elevator from the corner to retain a clear demarcation of the primary building, and roofline.
- 2. An elevator should not be falsified into a chimney; although it's aesthetically inconvenient, it can certainly be made a feature of the house in a less visible location.
- 3. While the guest house was constructed in 2006, constructing an addition onto the front of it presents an awkward relationship to the primary building; we feel that any addition should be located on the rear of it.

Staff Recommendation: Denial with staff comments.

July 22, 2021 Page | 3

5. 157 Wentworth Street, unit E - - TMS # 457-03-04-008 BAR2021-000509

Request preliminary approval for new 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ story house at rear.

New Construction

(Harleston Village)

Old and Historic District

Owner: Applicant: 157 Wentworth Street, LLC Neil Stevenson Architects

MOTION:

Deferral with staff comments 2-5 noted, and board comment to clarify the specification of all materials, and to eliminate the sloped columns.

MADE BY: HUEY SECOND: MARTIN VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

- 1. We continue to urge the applicant to lean toward a more traditional design as noted in the last presentation. Elements such as the slanted columns should be eliminated.
- Other items that appear to give the design a suburban feel are the bulky trim, the heavy
 columns, and the extraneous trim on the dormers. Refine these elements by reducing or
 eliminating.
- Board and batten siding is out of character with the proportions of the house and the character of the street. Eliminate in favor of the previous siding, and specify product source for cement fiber board.
- 4. The building was already pushing the envelope in terms of height, and subordination (especially) to the carriage house, but this extra foot is concerning and should be reduced by floor-to-floor height adjustments.
- 5. Staff continue concern about the rear porch proportions, French doors, windows, and add to it cabled railings; we feel this entire south elevation warrants restudy.

Staff Recommendation: Deferral with staff comments noted.

6. 40 Savage Street - - TMS # 457-12-03-131

BAR2021-000568

Request conceptual approval for renovation including rear addition.

Not Rated

MOTION:

(Charlestowne)

c. 1838

Conceptual approval with staff comments 1 and 2; and final review by staff.

Old and Historic District

Owner:

Chris Allen

Applicant:

e e fava architects

MADE BY: MARTIN SECOND: HUEY VOTE: FOR $\underline{5}$ AGAINST $\underline{0}$

Staff Comments:

- 1. The height of the roof ridge should be lowered to be more subordinate to the primary building, perhaps with a flat roof.
- 2. While we appreciate the differentiation, the fenestration scale on the front of the house should be reduced to be more compatible with the primary building. The door and window on the south elevation of the addition do not seem entirely compatible warranting restudy.
- 3. Please detail the material of the street facing south elevation at the addition.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval with staff comments and final review by staff.

7. 12 Tradd Street - - TMS # 458-09-03-155

BAR2021-000569

Request conceptual approval for rear addition to kitchen house.

Category 3 (Charlestowne)

c. 1*7*48-*5*0

Old and Historic District

Owner:
Applicant:

Bowe and Edward Pritchard e e fava architects

. .

e e rava aramecis

WITHDRAWN FOR STAFF REVIEW

July 22, 2021

Page | 4

8. 75 South Battery - - TMS # 457-11-02-040

BAR2021-000570

Request preliminary approval for new construction of second-story addition over existing one-story rear addition.

Not Rated

(Charlestowne)

c. 1953

Old and Historic District

Owner:

Lyle and Alison Passink

Applicant:

Victoric Goss – Beau Clowney Architects

MOTION:

Conceptual approval and final review by staff

MADE BY: GARDNER SECOND: MARTIN VOTE: FOR 5 AGAINST 0

Staff Comments:

Staff have only one objection which is likely difficult to address with the current addition
in place, which would be to disengage the addition from the roofline of the historic
building. Similarly, it would be nice if the addition was no coplanar to the existing
building to clearly delineate the addition from the primary building.

Staff Recommendation: Conceptual approval and final review by staff.

9. 127 Smith Street - - TMS # 460-15-04-012

BAR2021-000571

Request conceptual approval for the new construction of a single-family residence.

New Construction

(Radcliffeborough)

Old and Historic District

Owner: Applicant: Michael Ellison Michael Ellison

Deferred by Applicant

Lindsdy Van Slambrook, chairwoman

date

August 5, 2021

date

Kim Hlavin, BAR-S Administrator